

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: JOHN JEREMY CHURCHILL PLATT

For: HIGH FREQUENCY BROADBAND ANTENNA

Serial No.: 10/711,905

Examiner: Tho Gia Phan

Filed: October 12, 2004

Group Art Unit: 2821

Atty. Docket: 71368-0072

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope
PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450

☒ transmitted via EFS Web filing to the Patent and Trademark
Office to Examiner Tho Gia Phan addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents.

/Rebecca L. Shilt/

Signature

Date: January 27, 2006

Rebecca L. Shilt

(type or print name of person certifying)

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 31, 2005. Applicant requests further consideration and examination in view of the following remarks:

No amendments are made to the application.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks

Claims 1-7 were in the application as last examined. No amendments are made to the specification or to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and consideration in light of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,899,787 to Czerwinski. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Czerwinski does not disclose a conductive sleeve provided *over* the dielectric housing. In Czerwinski, while the sleeve 58 is over the conductive radiating element 12, it is *inside* of the dielectric housing 52 and not *over* the dielectric housing 52 as required in claim 1. Because the element of a conductive sleeve provided over the dielectric housing at the feed point of the dipole antenna element is not found in Czerwinski, the reference does not anticipate claim 1.

Since claims 2, 3 and 5 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, they are likewise not anticipated by Czerwinski. Respectfully, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Czerwinski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,564 to Seward et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

There is no motivation or suggestion in the references for making the alleged combination, and therefore it would not have been obvious to make the combination. More importantly, however, even if the alleged combination were proper, it would still not reach the invention of claims 6 and 7. Both claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and therefore require a conductive sleeve provided over the dielectric housing at the feed point of the dipole antenna element. Nothing in Czerwinski or in Seward teaches or

suggests this element of the claims. Therefore, the claims are patentable over the alleged combination.

The Examiner has determined that the subject matter of claim 4 is allowable. But in view of the patentability of the remaining claims, it is believed that rewriting claim 4 into independent form is unnecessary.

Conclusion

In the absence of any other cited art, it is believed that all of the claims are now allowable and early notice of Allowability is respectfully requested. Any questions concerning the foregoing may be directed to the undersigned at 616-742-3513 or (jeb@mcgarrybair.com).

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN JEREMY CHURCHILL PLATT

Dated: January 27, 2006

By: /Joel E Bair/
Joel E. Bair, Reg. No. 33,356
McGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500
Fax 616-742-1010
E-mail jeb@mcgarrybair.com

G0207687.DOC